

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-14, 16-19, 23-25, 28-30, and 32-35 are pending, with claims 1, 12, and 25 being independent. Claims 4, 8, 9, 15, 20-22, 26, 27, and 31 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 12, 25, and 28 have been amended herein. No new subject matter has been added.

Support for amendments to Claims 1, 12, and 25 can be found at least at Figures 2-4 and 8; Figure 10 (items 301, 305, and 310 of screen 300); and page 17, lines 1-17 of the application as filed.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

“As reiterated by the Supreme Court in *KSR*, the framework for the objective analysis for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 is stated in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966). Obviousness is a question of law based on underlying factual inquiries” including “[a]scertaining the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art” (MPEP 2141(II)). “In determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. 103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious” (emphasis in original; MPEP 2141.02(I)). Applicants note that “[t]he prior art reference (or references when combined) need not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, however, Office personnel must explain why the difference(s) between the prior art and the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art” (emphasis added; MPEP 2141(III)).

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-14, 16-19, 23-25, 28-30, and 32-35

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-14, 16-19, 23-25, 28-30, and 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,539,303 to McClure et al. (hereafter McClure), U.S. Patent No. 5,974,403 to Weindorf. Applicants have reviewed the cited art and respectfully submit that the embodiments as recited in Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-14, 16-19, 23-25, 28-30, and 32-35 are patentable over the cited combination in view of at least the following rationale.

Attention is directed to Claim 1, which recites (emphasis added):

An integrated guidance system comprising:

- a position determination system adapted for determining a current position;

- a differential global position determination system adapted for using a differential correction process to correct errors, wherein a differential correction may be stored in an electronic file and accessed later or said differential correction may be applied in real time;

- a lightbar device adapted for providing a visual representation of a deviation of said current position from a desired path to guide movement along said desired path;

- a data input device for scrolling, selecting, and editing operations, including configuring said position determining system with a menu, and wherein said data input device comprises a first button, a second button, and a third button;

- a display device for displaying text, said menu and graphics, said text, said menu, and said graphics adapted to be viewable under various light conditions, wherein an operator is able to vary the contrast and brightness of said text, said menu, and said graphics by using buttons to interact with a user interface of said integrated guidance system, and wherein said first button, said second button, and said third button facilitate interacting with a plurality of available functions displayed on said display device, and wherein said display device is configured for presenting a perspective view graphic to assist in guidance along with first text that describes said desired path and second text that describes deviation from said desired path;

- a processor adapted for facilitating user interaction by integrating operation of said position determination system, said lightbar device, said data input device, and said display device; and

a housing enclosing said position determination system, said lightbar device, said data input device, said display device and said processor, wherein said housing has a first wing-shaped portion and a second wing-shaped portion configured to protect a cable connector extending from said housing, wherein said light bar and said display device are positioned on a front of said housing, and wherein said first button, said second button, and said third button of said data input device are positioned on a top surface of said housing for convenient access by an operator of said integrated guidance system, wherein said top surface of said housing is substantially orthogonally adjacent to said front of said housing, and wherein said first button is larger than said second button and said third button to reduce the need for visual assistance by said operator to distinguish said first button, said second button, and said third button.

Independent Claims 12 and 25 include similar features that were rejected with similar rationale to that used in the rejection of Claim 1. Claims 2-3, 5-7, 10, and 11 depend from Claim 1 and recite further features thereof. Claims 13-14, 16-19, 23-24 depend from Claim 12 and recite further features thereof. Claims 28-30, and 32-35 depend from claim 25 and recite further features thereof.

Applicants submit that McClure does not teach or suggest, “... a display device ... wherein said display device is configured for presenting a perspective view graphic to assist in guidance along with first text that describes said desired path and second text that describes deviation from said desired path,” as is recited in Claim 1 and similarly in Claims 12 and 25. Indeed, nothing regarding such a perspective graphic, let alone a perspective graphic presented along with first text that describes a desired path and second text that describes deviation from the desired path is mentioned within McClure. At most, Applicants understand that McClure may describe dot matrix LCD display with a capacity for displaying several lines of multiple characters (see display 34 of Figure 1 and col. 5, lines 35-56 of McClure). However, Applicants

submit that this falls far short of disclosing the above recited feature of Applicants' Claims 1, 12, and 25.

Moreover, Applicants submit that nothing in Weindorf, even when viewed in combination with McClure, cures this deficiency. As such, for at least this reason, Applicants submit that the cited combination of McClure in view of Weindorf fails to disclose all of the features of Claims 1, 12, and 25 and therefore does not render these claims obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants additionally submit that McClure does not teach or suggest, "...a housing enclosing said position determination system ... wherein said light bar and said display device are positioned on a front of said housing, and wherein said first button, said second button, and said third button of said data input device are positioned on a top surface of said housing for convenient access by an operator of said integrated guidance system, wherein said top surface of said housing is substantially orthogonally adjacent to said front of said housing," as is recited in Claim 1 and similarly in Claims 12 and 25 (of note, a light bar is not mentioned in Claim 25). Indeed, nothing regarding such a disposition of display and/or light bar on a front and input buttons on a substantially orthogonally adjacent surface from the front is mentioned in McClure. Instead, Applicants understand McClure to disclose that input buttons (12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, and 24) appear to be collocated on the same face/side of McClure's guidance unit 8 (see Figure 2 of McClure). This is very different than and may even be viewed teach away from the above recited Claim feature of Applicants' Claims 1, 12, and 25 by disclosing that display 34, steering guide 30, and current position display 32 are all located on the same face/side of unit 8 as input

buttons 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, and 24 rather than on a substantially orthogonally adjacent surface as is recited in Applicants' Claims 1, 12, and 25.

Moreover, Applicants submit that nothing in Weindorf, even when viewed in combination with McClure, cures this deficiency. At best, Weindorf generically indicates in col. 6, lines 8 - 18 that, "... the user interface is one or more knobs or push buttons, a touch screen, a voice activated system, or other means of user selections....user interface 112 may be located elsewhere, may be incorporated with another controller or user interface, and may be included in a remote control device." This teaching is very unspecific and, as such, Applicants submit that it would not provide motivation to one of skill in the art to modify McClure, to arrive at Applicants' above recited claim feature, especially as McClure appears to teach away from Applicants' above recited Claim feature. As such, for at least this additional reason, Applicants submit that the cited combination of McClure in view of Weindorf fails to disclose all of the features of Claims 1, 12, and 25 and therefore does not render these claims obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Additionally, and as required by the MPEP as cited above, the present Rejection fails to explain why the identified differences between Applicants' claimed inventions and McClure in view of Weindorf would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

In view of the combination of McClure in view of Weindorf not disclosing all of the features of Applicants' Claims 1, 12, and 25, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 12, and 25 overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and that these claims are

thus in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit the combination of McClure in view of Weindorf also does not teach or suggest the claimed embodiments as recited in Claims 2-3, 5-7, 10, and 11 that depend from Claim 1; Claims 13-14, 16-19, 23-24 that depend from Claim 12; and Claims 28-30, and 32-35 that depend from Claim 25. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-3, 5-7, 10-11, 13-14, 16-19, 23-24, 28-30, and 32-35 also overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to McClure in view of Weindorf, and are in a condition for allowance by virtue of their dependence from allowable base claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks and amendments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Dated: November 6, 2009

/John P. Wagner, Jr./

John P. Wagner, Jr.

Registration No. 35,398

Wagner Blecher LLP
123 Westridge Drive
Watsonville, CA 95076
(408) 377-0500